

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

**VOL II**

**NEW YORK, MAY 22, 1909**

**No 28**

Under the title *The Privileged Classes* Professor Barrett Wendell has recently published four essays, two of which are particularly interesting to us. One, *Our National Superstition*, is reprinted from *The North American Review* of September, 1904. It is that well-known essay in which he develops the thesis that with all its faults the old curriculum of *Classes* and *mathematics* had the effect of developing the faculty of voluntary attention, the faculty most important for all progress in any field, and that the modern system has as yet failed in this respect. As he says:

The Classics and mathematics have doubtless been tyrannical; what is worse, they have been supercilious. There can be little doubt that the day of their dominance is past, and that resentment of their pretensions will long blind the educational authorities of our democratic country and age to the real nature of their educational potency. Of all educational superstitions, we may freely admit, none is more instantly apparent than that which worships the classics and mathematics as idols. And yet the newer educational superstition, which bows the knee to pedagogics, is beginning to seem more mischievously idolatrous still. For behind the dethroned idols there was an orthodox truth, not yet discernible behind the new; and the education which resulted from the elder system had a virtue which must somehow be revived, if the new is to justify the magnificent and generous faith of our still youthful America.

The other essay, *Of Education*, has not hitherto been published, and it discusses many matters, including Classics, English composition, science, etc. There is a vein of cynical humor in parts of the essay as when he sets forth the qualities of the ideal teacher.

An ideal teacher must have something like first-rate vigor. A man with first-rate vigor will rarely be content to remain a teacher any longer than may be needful. The trouble goes so far as to have excited, from a friend of mine, the paradoxical opinion that no youth who desires to teach will ever be fit for the work. Only two kinds of teachers, this not very authoritative personage went on to propound, generally turn out well. One of these groups consists of scholars—of men who have a voracious appetite for learning, who count the day ill-spent when they do not go to bed in possession of knowledge acquired since they woke up in the morning. Scholarship, alone and unaided, will not provide them with bread and butter; to keep themselves alive for the vigorous delights of it, they have to teach by the way. The vital power of their teaching, the while, springs from the untiring enthusiasm of

their scholarship. Here is a superiority not to be gainsaid. The other group of efficient teachers my friend described by the less complimentary name of *lame ducks*. They are the men who have had the native spirit to yearn for the experience of measuring themselves, in the full struggle of active life, with fellows of their own size, or bigger; and who, for one or another reason—often from infirmity of health—have not quite managed to hold their own. They include, he was cordially prepared to admit, the fledglings, who consent to nestle for a year or two in schools before they take flight to wider fields of activity—such characters as the Chief Justice who began work as a teacher by thrashing the school bully. The type of them, however, is to be found in the game fowl who has been brought down, early or late, but who has not lost the spirit which made him eager to fly high and far among, and against, his equals. The metaphor grows confused, perhaps, but not the significance of it; in which significance lurks one reason why, on general principles, people are still impulsively disposed to prefer a man for a teacher to a woman. There lurks in it, as well, an evident reason why it is generally easier to find the right kind of women who are willing to teach than to find anything like equally impressive men.

But of more importance for us are his references to classical teaching and its possibilities.

Or take the matter of the Classics, as they used to be taught thirty-odd years ago. Latin and Greek may be regarded in some aspects as technical subjects, like the modern languages which our foregoing considerations will show not yet quite satisfactorily to have supplanted them. In one technical matter—that of grammatical detail—they are the most drearily efficient gymnastic trainers of voluntary attention as yet discovered by European men. In another aspect they may better be regarded as philosophic subjects. So far as they may properly be described as “the humanities”, revealing to us the primitive experience of European culture, they are wholly so. When I was a boy, one had to study them every day for a good many years. At school and at college, for example, I had ten years of Latin and six or eight of Greek. My own experience was about that of my contemporaries. I acquired, to be sure, some detailed knowledge of grammar, and the incidental training of my voluntary attention was not to be lamented. After all those years of faithful work with texts and dictionaries and grammars, however, I was unable to read a single page of either language currently; and what scrappy knowledge of either literature I had acquired had been derived either from talks with the stimulating teachers on whom I had occasionally chanced to fall, or from reading books in English about the texts of which I could make neither head nor tail in Greek or in Latin. Something was evidently

wrong. I still feel almost justified for having resentfully spoken against classical teaching, at different times ever since. My classical colleagues assure me now that things go better. It is welcome news—not yet widely confirmed, nevertheless, by conclusive evidence of reviving enthusiasm for classical culture among undergraduates. . . . Or consider the case of the Classics in the last generation, on which we also touched. People can be taught, in no excessive time, to read the Latin language, and probably the Greek, too. If you are beset with any doubts on this point you have only to remember that for something like a thousand years after Latin ceased to be a normally living language, it was used as a vehicle of instruction at every university throughout Europe. What is more, the Classics can be read as literature, otherwise there would have been no such thing as the Renaissance, and bewigged members of Parliament could never have quoted Horace. The trouble grows pretty clear. Old-fashioned classical teaching complacently assumed that its object was to make everybody who was submitted to it a thorough technical scholar; whereas what we really demand from classical teaching nowadays is not a world full of learned professors, but all the culture which the Classics can possibly stimulate. In the Greek days and Roman, the primal civilization of Europe gave to all posterity ideals and forms of thought which we now recognize as at once purely European and inevitably ancestral to ourselves. The more of us who can learn to know what classical literature means, the better for everybody; but we may generally leave to the grammarians the names by which the poets, or more often their commentators, happened to call this or that mood or tense or case. As human beings, we are concerned only with the human significance of case or tense or mood when used in lines which have lived to be immortal vehicles of human thought and emotion. Your professor must know all about them, of course; so must your student who is preparing for a professorship; but you or I need only read, and enjoy and think. The trouble here was with the ideal; and that ideal, our classical friends assure us, they are changing.

I shall have something to say about this subject in the next issue. G. L.

#### NOTES ON THE TEACHING OF LATIN IN ENGLAND<sup>1</sup>

I might preface what I have to say to you to-day with various excuses and explanations nicely calculated to disarm criticism, but I shall content myself with the mere statement that I am aware that England was not, prior to my landing on its shores, an undiscovered country, and aware also that my explorations were too brief to justify me in presuming to speak with authority of the condition or the methods of English teaching of the Classics. I wish only to tell you some of my more or less casual observations, and shall confine myself to the teaching of Latin, since this is a Latin Club. Perhaps I should add that my visit seems to me to have yielded larger results than its length would lead one to expect, partly because I have been for

some years interested in the classical traditions and ideals of the mother country and in the discussions of methods that have recently been so general and so fruitful there, partly because I was helped in getting to the inside of things by connections already established.

I have been a member of the English Classical Association since its formation, and I am sure I cannot better occupy a portion of my time than in calling your attention to some of the activities of that organization. It now exercises a potent influence on the methods of teaching in a large majority of the schools, and seems likely both to unify and to transform the classical discipline of the country. This position of influence has been earned by the serious and solid work of its Council and various committees. It is noteworthy that the organizations of teachers in England are generally devoted to active work; they do not exist primarily for the purpose of giving an opportunity to read papers. A large part of the program of any meeting is sure to be given up to *agenda*, and a large part of the report of the meeting to *acta*. The addresses that are delivered at the annual meetings of The Classical Association are, almost without exception, such as help and inspire all who feel any interest in the literature and life of classical antiquity.

I confess that I have an ulterior object in speaking at length of The Classical Association. Steps have been taken looking to the affiliation of this society with similar societies in various parts of the British Empire, and I have reason to believe that some of the officers of the English society would be glad to further similar affiliation with societies of teachers of the Classics in this country. Our three Classical Associations would, I am sure, increase their influence and helpfulness if they could make arrangements by which their members would receive the Proceedings of The Classical Association and The Year's Work in Classical Studies. The latter is edited for The Classical Association by Dr. Rouse, and is sent to all members of the Association upon payment of postage. The third number contains 176 pages, in 18 sections, each section by an authority in the subject treated. The headings of the sections are: Classical Work in Schools; Excavations in Greece; Italian Excavation; Prehistoric Archaeology; Sculpture and Minor Arts; Ancient Numismatics; Greek Mythology and Religion; Roman Religion and Mythology; Greek Inscriptions; Greek History; Roman History; Grammar, Lexicography, and Metric; Textual Criticism and Palaeography (Latin); Papyri; Literature; Roman Britain; Hellenistic Greek; New Testament. Among the contributors are Messrs. Ashby, Farnell, Fowler, Sonnenschein, Lindsay, and Sandys. I think it will readily be acknowledged that one weak spot in the teaching of the Classics

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at a luncheon of The New York Latin Club on February 27, 1909.

in this country is the narrow range of the teacher's reading in his own field of work, and I believe no other one thing would help us so much in this respect as the general distribution each year of this review of the year's discoveries, publications, and discussions.

You are all readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, and know what signal success has attended the Association's recommendation of the so-called reformed pronunciation of Latin, our Roman pronunciation<sup>1</sup>. This success has been due, in part, to the prescription of the new pronunciation for schools receiving grants from the national Board of Education. The new pronunciation has been adopted by the universities also, but one famous scholar at Oxford told me he could not use it yet in his lectures, for the reason that his hearers had been taught the old pronunciation in school, and would not be able to understand the new pronunciation. In a few schools, it may be noted, the use of the Roman method antedates considerably the recent agitation, and in the City of London School, St. Olave's School, London, the Perse School, Cambridge, and the new secondary schools established in accordance with recent legislation of Parliament I found the pronunciation of Latin entirely smooth and correct. On the other hand, both masters and students in the schools which are just making the change are evidently having difficulty.

But everywhere large quantities of Latin are read aloud fluently and with some approximation to an intelligent expression of the meaning, and long selections of poetry are recited from memory. Most schools follow, I fancy, the rule which I am told obtains in Germany, that reading shall always precede translation. The expressiveness of the reading of poetry is especially noteworthy. I heard very little scanning, although it was apparent that this had not been neglected; and not a single word did I hear about time or the metronome, about treatment of elision, about the place of the caesura, not a syllable to indicate that scholars had been disputing as to whether ictus or word-accent has the right of way. It was demanded only that the reader should know the meaning of that which he was reading and should be able to pronounce the words correctly. And still the reading was, on the whole, rhythmical. Moreover, I did not see anything in the pronunciation of teachers or students that indicated perturbation of mind as to hidden quantities, the common practice being to sound as short all vowels standing before two consonants.

At the last general meeting of The Classical Association steps were taken looking to the creation of a committee representing the associations of teachers of languages, ancient and modern, to deal with the question of grammatical terminology. More

than twenty years ago Professor Sonnenschein made an effort to bring about some uniformity of nomenclature in his series of so-called parallel grammars, and he has now returned to the subject with fresh enthusiasm. In the meantime the schools of Prussia have been required to maintain the unity of grammar in the instruction in different languages, and there has appeared for the use of the German Reform-Gymnasien a series of books in which the principle is adopted. I wish it were possible for us in America to have a share in the deliberations of our English brethren. I think they would concede that we are doing more and better work than they in the way of syntactical investigations in Greek and Latin; we are certainly proposing annually more than our share of new terms; and surely nowhere under heaven can there be a land in which there is greater confusion in grammatical terminology or greater failure on the part of boys and girls to master the grammar of any single language, even their own.

I am of those who believe that the teacher is the chief factor in the work of a school. What, then, of the English teacher of the Classics? In the first place, he is not, in the case of the great public schools, primarily teacher of Greek or Latin, but the master of the form and responsible for all its studies. Inasmuch, however, as the Classics form far the major part of the work of boys 'on the classical side' (that is, those taking the classical course), there are in all these schools men who are teaching practically nothing but Greek and Latin. We may note in passing that the fact that they are teaching both Greek and Latin is in every way advantageous. They are, almost without exception, men who have won high honors as classical students at the universities. Their wide reading at school and university and the humanistic traditions that surround them insure their familiarity with the literatures they profess to teach, and the variety of their reading with their students contributes to the same result.

It is difficult to make any clear statement concerning the course of study or the methods of teaching, for several reasons. The quantity of work and the manner of doing it vary widely with the school, and, in the case of the older schools, with the plans and the ability of the individual student. The Latin for students on the modern side is much less severe than for those on the classical side, and the boy who is ambitious to win the distinction of scholarships and other honors at the school and the university continues his classical studies longer than the one who cares only to matriculate at the university and proceed to the 'pass' or 'ordinary' B. A. degree.

Promotion is not restricted to the end of the school year, but a boy may go to a higher form at

<sup>1</sup> See *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, 2, 73.



the end of any term if his ability and attainments have earned the advancement. If he fails of promotion from his form before he has come to a certain age he is dismissed from the school as 'superannuated'. The statistics of Rugby for the term ending April, 1908, give three terms as the highest average of the time spent by boys in any form on the classical side and one and one-half terms as the lowest average; from three to seven terms as the longest time in a form, the figures varying for the different forms; and one term as the shortest time in the case of each of the forms. I cannot be sure that this last figure indicates rapid promotion in every case, since boys are admitted to the lower forms of the school at the beginning of any term. I saw nothing in the English school system that seemed to me more admirable than this arrangement of the work by terms rather than years. The incentive offered by the possibility of frequent promotion must be a great spur and the promotion itself a substantial advantage to the boy. Moreover, it is obvious that the opportunity of entering a school at any one of three times during the year, and without the disadvantage of taking up the work of the class midway, is likewise a convenience and an encouragement.

Indeed, in visiting an English school one is struck at once with the visible effect of the combination of elasticity of classification and persistent competition in stimulating interest and inspiring effort on the part of the students. In every school there are students who must hold scholarships in order to complete their education at school and university, and these scholarships are regularly open to competition. In some schools, especially those maintained by the local educational authorities, practically no students are preparing for the universities except those who hope to win scholarships. Apart, however, from pecuniary considerations, the distinctions to which students may attain at school and college and the significance of these distinctions in the way of public respect, together with their helpful influence upon one's future career, are always before the eyes of the boy of ability. And for every boy there is the rivalry for place in his form, his position relative to his fellows being known every year, term, week—changing even perhaps several times in the course of a lesson.

There is now much discussion in England of all educational matters, which are indeed in ferment and confusion, and the position of the Classics is again in question, or rather the traditional method of dealing with them in the public schools. Many of the greatest classical scholars and teachers of the country are insistent that Oxford and Cambridge shall give up compulsory Greek for the bachelor's degree, and Greek is not taught on the

modern side in the public schools, nor is it taught in the new secondary schools supported from the rates. It seems to be the prevalent view that it is pabulum only for the scholar and the gentleman. On the other hand, Latin is recognized as of prime importance as an instrument in secondary education. The regulations of the Board of Education "require that in any school in which two languages other than English are taken, and Latin is not one of them, the Board must be satisfied that the omission of Latin is for the educational advantage of the school".

I have already mentioned the difficulties in the way of making any clear general statement as to the course of study. Perhaps I cannot do better than put before you the Latin course of a typical school, St. Peter's College, Westminster, one of the oldest of the public schools, having been established by Henry VIII. To enter this and similar schools a boy must have already made some start in Latin. This preparation he usually receives in one of the preparatory schools, of which there are now in the country about four hundred of recognized standing. The following is a bare statement of the Latin work on the classical side at Westminster during the year 1906-7:

Fourth form: Rivington's Latin Reader, 34 pages; Tripartita; Kennedy's Shorter Latin Primer (the accidence).

Classical Remove form: Caesar's Gallic War, I, 1 to 25; V, 26 to 48, and half of VI; Abbott's *Via Latina*; accidence.

Under fifth form: Vergil's *Aeneid*, about 300 lines from V; Caesar's Gallic War, II and III; 100 pages of North and Hillard's Latin Prose Composition; Kennedy's Revised Latin Primer.

Middle fifth form: Selections from Cicero; 26 chapters from Livy XXI; 60 pages of North and Hillard's exercises, and, during the last two terms of the year, exercises from Bradley's book; Revised Latin Primer.

Upper fifth form: practically the same as the middle fifth.

Under shell form: Cicero's first oration against Catiline and that for Archias; Vergil's *Eclogues*; compositions in prose and in elegiac verse; grammar; translation at sight.

Upper shell form: The *Phormio*; 34 chapters of Livy XXIII; *Georgics* IV; composition and grammar.

Sixth form: The *Phormio*; 30 chapters of Livy XXVIII; Horace, *Epistles* I; Pliny, *Epistles* VI; *Aeneid* X; the first book of Caesar's *Civil War*.

Seventh form: Selected letters of Cicero; the *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* X; the *Phormio*; selected epigrams of Martial, including the seventh book; Tacitus, *Annals* I; Livy IX; prose and verse composition; translation at sight.

To this is to be added the requirement in 'repetition'. In the year 1906-1907 a boy in the seventh form, for instance, was expected to be able to repeat from memory large selections from the *Georgics*; one in the sixth form, the first 400 lines of *Aeneid* IV. This requirement reaches down to the

lowest form, and is not confined to Latin, but includes also long passages of English and, in the two upper forms, Greek poetry.

It may help you to estimate the extent and the variety of the work in Latin in an English public school if I give a list of books bought by the sixth form at Charterhouse during the year 1907-1908; a collection of passages for translation at sight; *Foliorum Centuriae*; *Foliorum Silva*; editions of Cicero's second Philippic, his oration for Murena, and a selection from his letters; editions of Horace's *Epistles* and *Ars Poetica*, Vergil's *Bucolics* and *Georgics*, the first three books of Lucretius, and the *Germania* of Tacitus; Lewis and Short's dictionary; Beesly's *Gracchi*, Marius and Sulla; Oman's *Seven Roman Statesmen*. To this should be added the classical dictionary, English-Latin dictionary, Roman history, and the like, already in the hands of the boys.

But all this gives only a hint of the way in which Latin is taught in English schools, and I must endeavor to supplement it by some account of the fashion of treating the books and the boys. The first thing to note is that there is much more teaching, in the earlier stages at least, than with us, and much less hearing of lessons. This is rendered necessary by the immaturity of the boys and made possible by the generous allowance of time to the subject. At Harrow I was told that a boy spent on an average five hours daily in school and three hours in preparation. In the second year's work at Eton a boy has sixteen hours of classical work in school each week, five of mathematical, two of science, and three of French. Perhaps one-half as much time is usually required for preparation, not reckoning the large amount of written work to be done outside of school. In addition every boy has a tutor, with whom he remains in close relations throughout his school career. The tutor hears the boy construe before he goes to class, and criticizes some of his written exercises. In the next higher form the boy goes to his tutor twice or thrice a week, usually to read some classical book with a few others. At Harrow I visited a 'pupil-room', a meeting of a house master with the boys of his house for tutorial work. Part of the time was given to the discussion of an exercise in Latin composition, part to unprepared translation by way of practice.

It is no exaggeration, I think, to say that in every Latin class of all kinds of schools there is almost daily written work, not on a blackboard, for that is only for the expositions of the teacher, but with pen and ink. This written work consists of exercises in prose composition, grammar papers, and, in the older schools, verses. Grammar and composition papers are commonly written in school,

and are often discussed at once by the teacher, the students correcting their own or their neighbors' mistakes. Whether so corrected or not, they go into the hands of the teacher, who marks them and returns them later with helpful criticism.

In the schools which maintain the traditional methods prose composition is generally regarded as a most important means of teaching the language, if not the chief end of its study. In the first stage of the work in composition time and labor are given unstintingly to the analysis of the structure of English sentences and the fixing of the Latin equivalents in the minds of the students. I was present at an exercise of this sort in a preparatory school, during the course of which, if my memory does not fail, not a single Latin word was used. The lesson was on the ablative absolute. The teacher put on the blackboard names denoting the elements of a simple sentence—subject, verb, object—and to these added *participle*. English sentences were then analyzed, and the words composing them written under the proper headings. Finally, the class was asked to tell what form would be used in Latin for each word of the sentence. When the participle was reached it was discovered that it modified subject or object, or neither. In the latter case a little questioning brought the class to the ablative absolute construction.

At Eton the elect attain to original composition in verse, and indeed Latin versification has not been generally given up, despite the attacks upon it. In a book now out of print the present head-master of Eton some years ago enumerated the following as benefits to be gained from this training: "Richness and precision of vocabulary, sense of rhythm, observation of nature, stimulus of imagination, the sense of completion, and the sense of self-expression".

The Etonian is taught to make Latin verses thus: first he is given English sufficient to fill out, when translated into Latin, the line required; later he is called upon to supply some English words to complete the required line; he passes from these mechanical exercises to the rendering of English poetry freely into Latin; and at last he is given only a subject on which to write. The meter is usually elegiac, but sometimes lyric; and the number of verses required each week varies from eighteen to twenty-four, according to the ability of the student. An examination in Latin verse composition is required for entrance.

In more than one school I heard young students in difficulty told to construe the sentence in which they stumbled by finding subject, verb, object, in the order of English. Frequently I saw sentences so divided up between two or more students that each translated only a phrase or a clause. Such

methods would seem to an American teacher to preclude the possibility of ever appreciating the literature, yet everywhere I found students in the upper forms translating easily into clear, idiomatic English. I suppose the explanation is to be found in two things—familiarity with good English and long, careful training in translation. At first all the Latin read is translated in class before it is assigned for study, and sooner or later the student comes to know the idiomatic English equivalent of every Latin construction. Then, too, no Latin is read which is beyond the mastery of the student. He begins with simple sentences, such as we have in our beginner's books; he goes from these not to Caesar or Nepos, but to carefully graduated 'made Latin', thence to simplified texts, then to simple selections. There are many readings-books of all these sorts available, and others are coming from the presses all the time.

Translation at sight, or 'unseen translation', plays a large part in the work. As we have seen, all translation at the beginning of the course is first done at sight. Later it is usual to translate at sight each day in advance of the portion assigned for preparation, and frequently the whole hour is given over to translation of unprepared passages. It is generally recognized that the ability to translate at sight is the supreme test of mastery of the language. It is the only test for Latin-English translation set on the Common Examination for Entrance to Public Schools, the examination for a school certificate of the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board, and the matriculation examination of the University of London. In Oxford Responsions, the Previous Examination at Cambridge, the Oxford Local Examinations, and the junior and senior Cambridge Local Examinations papers are offered in set books, but the prescribed test in unprepared books is more important, and an additional test of this kind may be taken instead of the paper on the set books. The use of a dictionary is allowed in writing the prescribed paper on unprepared books for the Cambridge Previous Examination. I mention this because I have for some time held, but have not ventured to express, the opinion that a boy or girl who can translate Latin at sight with the help of a dictionary should be considered qualified, so far as Latin is concerned, for admission to an American college.

I turn last to the most interesting thing I saw in the classical teaching of England, the unique method employed in the Perse Grammar School, Cambridge. Though this method has for us the freshness of novelty, it is but a return to the medieval practice; and the verdict of time must determine whether it is reformatory or merely reactionary. The curriculum of the Perse School is largely

modeled upon that of the German Reform-Gymnasium. The teaching of Greek and Latin is based upon these two principles:

That the method of instruction should be direct; i. e., the thing or act associated directly with the foreign word, not described indirectly by the intermediary of an English word; that the accidence and syntax should be taught through use; i. e., speaking, reading, and writing, before paradigms are learnt by heart, not vice versa.

French is begun a year before Latin, and Greek or German two years after Latin. For the first four years of the course there are six Latin lessons a week; from that time on, for as many as three years, the boy who elects to specialize in the Classics has twenty-six lessons a week in Latin and Greek. The maximum time given to Latin is, therefore, seven years—those from twelve to nineteen. Dr. Rouse claims that a boy who takes the four years of required work attains better results in Latin under his system in 540 hours than in 2160 hours under the prevailing system.

The work in Greek and Latin is thus described in a circular of the school:

The oral method is largely used at the beginning, and throughout for practice side by side with translation and composition. It has this great advantage, that there is nothing mechanical about it: the answer never exactly repeats the question, but it differs in person, number, or other details, enough to make thinking necessary, not enough to cause delay. It considerably increases the readiness and quickness of the pupils, and keeps them from ever becoming bored. Question and answer are always practised on the subject matter of the lesson, as well as the events of daily life. When the boys have become familiar with the sound of the phrases, and recognize common expressions at once, they can begin to read a passage aloud and with a little explanation can be brought to understand it unprepared. In the Sixth Form, after the translation of the set portion has been done, it is the custom to go on reading aloud in the original: with full translation at first, and less and less afterwards as the author's vocabulary and style become familiar. Original composition is practised from an early stage. The pupils thus become very familiar with all common constructions, and their work, although in the early stages narrow in range, is accurate. . . . Grammar is taught systematically, but not by itself; it accompanies the texts, and is thus taught after its need has been felt by the pupil.

I cannot take the time to add to this general statement a full exposition of the details of the method of instruction, but must refer you to Dr. Rouse's article, *Classical Work and Method in the Twentieth Century*, in *Rivista di Scienza*, Vol. IV, No. VII<sup>1</sup>. In this article you will find also a plausible, if not convincing, argument for the method. More accessible is a general sketch of the method as applied to Latin, by the school's senior classical master, W. H. S. Jones, Esq. (*The Teaching of Latin*, Blackie). Mr. Jones has published a First

<sup>1</sup> See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 2, 31, 17-18.



Latin Book, which is meant to be merely suggestive and is expected to be supplemented by the teacher; and Dr. Rouse has prepared a First Greek Book.

In this school I listened to two lessons of the class beginning Latin, a lesson of the class beginning Greek, an exercise in Latin composition of the fourth form, and the reading of Catullus and Thucydides by the sixth form. In the case of the beginners the spoken Latin was confined, naturally, to a few simple, formulaic phrases, but in the other classes the vernacular was scarcely in use at all. The composition consisted in the writing of a story, which the teacher told first with many questions and much explanation, all in Latin, to make sure that the meanings of new words and the pith of the matter were clearly understood, and then retold more rapidly, keeping the meaning, but freely changing the words. The students were supposed to write the story in their own way, making a rough draft in class and polishing it before the next lesson. The advanced class read incredible amounts without translation, and with only so much discussion as was necessary to insure the understanding of the more difficult passages. I could see no reason to doubt that the boys in this class were reading Greek and Latin literature with intelligence and appreciation. How far the use in discussion of the language of the text read conduces to that end I am not sure, but I suppose it must help to the direct apprehension of the meaning. I may add that no time was lost thereby, for explanations were given no less promptly and briefly—by the students, of course, more briefly—than they could have been given in English. In all the upper forms of the school the lessons in the Classics hold the interest of the boys and spur their minds in a degree that is almost incredible, and I was forced to confess that for this school at any rate the method is an entire success. But I am not yet prepared to believe that it would be generally successful. Dr. Rouse is employing it under particularly favorable circumstances. All his boys have been taught to speak French easily before they begin Latin, his classes are very small, and he himself has an enthusiasm, a command of Greek and Latin, and a felicity in using these languages colloquially with clearness and piquancy to which few among us can hope to come. I have, however, for several years felt that there would be a gain if we should use Latin instead of English in the routine of our recitations, and I am now more strongly of that opinion. I have had in mind only general directions to the class and the like, things that have to be said often in one form or another. No large addition to the student's vocabulary would be necessary, while he would have fixed in his memory a few words and

phrases, and some important constructions, such as the troublesome prohibition.

You will be glad to know that I have finished. If you think I have been diffuse and long-winded, I can only say that you have reason to be thankful that you have got off so easily. I saw so much in England that interested me and stimulated my thoughts that the amount I should say to-day was determined only by the time I had in which to put my notes in order. Many of these notes remain untouched.

JOHN C. KIRTLAND

PHILLIPS EXETER ACADEMY

### REVIEWS

Livy: Book I and Selections from Books II-X.

Edited by Walter Dennison. New York: The Macmillan Co. (1908). Pp. XXXVII + 344.

The introduction of seventeen pages is divided under the following heads: Life, Works, Sources, Style, Manuscripts and Editions, The Early Legends, Books of Reference. Pages 1-204 include the text: all of Bk. 1; 2. 9-15 The Attempt of Tarquinius to Regain His Throne; 2. 19-20 The Battle of Lake Regillus; 2. 23-33. 3 The Struggle Between the Orders; 3. 26. 3-29. 7 The Dictatorship of Cincinnatus; 3. 33-58 The Rule of the Decemvirs; 5. 21-22 The Fall of Veii; 5. 33-49. 7 The Capture and Sack of Rome by the Gauls; 6. 35-42 The Licinio-Sextian Laws; 7. 2 The Introduction of Scenic Representations; 7. 6. 1-6 The Story of M. Curtius; 8. 3. 8-10 The Latin War; 9. 1-6. 3 The Disaster at the Caudine Forks; 10. 6-9. 6 The Lex Ogulnia and the Lex Valeria; 10. 27-29 The Battle of Sentinum; 10. 47. 2 The Census of the Year 293 B. C. Pages 205-335 include the notes, and pp. 337-344 an *index nominum* with abundant directions to the student regarding their pronunciation according to the English fashion.

The book is small enough to drop into a coat pocket and attractive in appearance. The page is clear and easy to read, while misprints are not numerous. On p. 55, § 6, we find *velle* for *valle*; on p. 69, § 1, *capue* for *eaque*; on p. 135, § 14, *oculus* for *oculos*; on p. 139, § 9, *cognominem* for *cognomen*; on p. 145, § 1, *desinatos* for *designatos*; on p. 244, § 6, *Is* is . . . for *It* is . . . ; on p. 245 (2d line), *indir. disc.* for *dir. disc.*; on p. 222, § 6, the words "it clearly looked as if the Romans would resort to violence" are evidently a translation and should be in italics; on p. 223, § 13, we find in the notes *scelus*, where the text has the correct *foedus*; and it was surely a *lapsus mentis* when the editor located the Caelian hill "southwest of the Palatine". The editor is inconsistent in spelling *Juppiter* in the text and *Jupiter* in the notes (compare 1. 12. 6-7).

A few cases of incorrect English occur, as, for instance, p. 218, "none of the structures are".

The editor has set himself the task of making his edition interesting to the student, who, he believes, "should study his Livy rather for the pleasure of reading and the cultivation of his literary sense than for a mere study of the peculiarities of Latin syntax", although he feels compelled to add the statement that "the latter is important and some attention must be given to it". Hence references to the grammars are not frequent, the first being met near the bottom of the sixth page of the notes, while the first twenty-five chapters of Book 1 contain only twenty, and chapters 46-60 none at all. Many constructions are, however, explained without references, and occasionally cross-reference is made to another note where the grammars are referred to. The list of grammars used—all the standard American editions—will be found hidden away in a footnote at the bottom of the sixth page of the commentary. Whenever a translation is given, an effort, usually happy, is made to express the thought neatly and idiomatically. This is a great point with the editor, and one of the marked features of this edition is the abundance of such suggested translations and neat turns of expression, which lessen to some extent the probability that the student will fall into *pidgin-English*. Sometimes the student is merely given timely warning how *not* to translate; so on p. 221, § 2, he is told not to translate *qui . . . peterent* by "who should seek". On p. 216, § 1, we find excellent suggestions on the method of translating long periodic sentences. The editor rightly feels that such suggestions and warnings should not be left altogether to the teacher, but should be given to the student exactly at the point of difficulty and when he is preparing his lesson. Attention is frequently called to the stylistic features of a passage. Compare p. 209, § 11. Figures are almost always noticed, and, when it is deemed necessary, explained.

These suggestions, warnings, model translations, etc., should, indeed, contribute to the "cultivation of the student's literary sense", but we could wish that the editor had also referred the student more frequently to the grammars, inasmuch as it is quite impossible either really to enjoy a Latin author or to appreciate his style without a close study of constructions.

The notes on each chapter are preceded by a short summary of its contents, and those on each selection are headed by a list of modern handbooks appropriate for parallel reading.

Probably the most unsatisfactory feature of the book is found in the notes dealing with points of syntax. Here the explanations are often vague, curiously worded, and at times even inaccurate. For instance, it is hard to understand what is meant by the note on *ausi sint*, p. 211, § 4, which is said to be "an independent use of the perfect subjunctive in a clause of result". *Praedae amissae* is incor-

rectly called on p. 215, § 3, a subjective genitive. Is it quite accurate to say that the preposition in the phrase *in centum annos induitae datae*, p. 230, § 5, "implies motion"? or to translate *fragore tonitribusque*, p. 231, § 1, by "a crash of thunder" instead of by "crashes of thunder"? *Facta fide immortalitatis*, p. 231, § 8, seems to express means rather than time, the main idea being contained in the participle. The statement, p. 259, § 2, that "in Latin an affirmative answer is given by repeating the verb which is used in asking the question" is only half the truth. *Cordi*, 1. 39. 4, may be a locative, but the student will look in vain in his grammars for any proof of the editor's statement, whereas the true locative *animi*, 1. 58. 9, is dismissed with the vague remark that it "has the force of a locative".

Other inaccuracies occur, such, for instance, as the statement, p. 212, § 5, that the word *Tiber* is perhaps from the same root as *Albula*, and that in which Decius is said, p. 325, § 4, to have "offered up himself and the legions and auxiliaries of the Romans to the divinities of the lower world", while the inconsistency referred to on p. 237, § 3, is purely imaginary.

The book contains three maps (of Italy, Rome and Latium), and a plan of the battle between the Romans and the Albans against the Veientes and the Fidenates. Every edition of Livy should contain good maps of the Forum and the Palatine hill.

On the whole, the edition is a good one, and it is sold at a very reasonable price. It should, in the hands of a competent teacher, prove stimulating to the student and lead him, in accordance with the author's wish, to appreciate good style and to love Livy.

WILBER J. GREER

WASHBURN COLLEGE, Topeka, Kansas.

C. Sallusti Crispi Bellum Catilinae. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by Daniel A. Penick, University of Texas. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. (1908). Pp. xx + 171.

This is an attractive and well-illustrated volume added to the Gildersleeve-Lodge Series.

In many respects it is an excellent piece of work. The introduction gives a clear idea of the things which a student should have in mind on beginning the reading of the text, and the commentary contains a great deal of valuable material. The longest section of the introduction is that on the Peculiarities of Sallust's Style, and the special characteristic of the book throughout is the fullness with which it treats the qualities of Sallust's Latinity—very naturally in the case of an author whose "amputatae sententiae et verba ante expectatum cadentia et obscura brevitates" were "pro cultu" in his own day and excited so much attention from later writers. The subject is one that perhaps interests the older student more than the younger pupils who usually



read the Catiline, but for them it is doubtless especially true that the qualities of style will hardly be felt at all unless they are pointed out.

The historical element in Mr. Penick's commentary is not so extensive as at some points seems desirable. The vocabulary of proper names at the end of the book, however, includes much of what might have been looked for in the running commentary.

Apart from questions of content, the shape in which the commentary is presented suggests an interesting problem of arrangement. An edition of this kind, of a work which has been repeatedly edited before under similar conditions, gets its valuation largely from qualities of taste and form, of pedagogical and artistic judgment, rather than the more serious elements of philological scholarship that enter into it. Even an occasional error, corrigible by the first comer, may be less serious than a fault in the general mode of presentation. At the same time the question of what constitutes such a fault is obviously open to a wide variance of opinion; and with this recognition I can venture to assert my own judgment with the greater freedom.

Mr. Penick's text is followed by notes, historical, grammatical and textual. These contain references to the sections and sub-sections of the introduction, to a syntactical appendix which follows the notes, and to the Latin grammars, as well as occasionally to the lexicon. There are also foot-notes to the text, consisting of references to the introduction and to the syntactical appendix. The syntactical appendix in turn contains references to the grammars.

Now the curiosity of the average boy of seventeen as to the mysteries of syntax is not compelling in an unlimited degree. If he turns from a snag in the text to the notes, and sees there a partial explanation and then a reference to the syntactical appendix and another to the introduction, and after reading the statement in the appendix finds a further reference to the grammar, to which he might have been referred at first and which repeats substantially the information given in the syntactical appendix, he is apt to have the harassed feeling of the street-car passenger who has too frequently been commanded to move on to the "car ahead". After a few such experiences the youthful adventurer is in danger of ceasing to follow his references altogether. Calculating the relative possibilities of missing something which he would deem worth while, or of being simply beguiled again, he assumes that the latter is the greater risk and takes his chances accordingly.

It may be said that the syntactical statements in the appendix are grouped apart to save repetition; but in some instances repetition is the plainest result of this arrangement. As an example, chosen

almost at random, take the note to line 609 (Chap. 33. 1): "*quo . . . uti*, a change of particles for the sake of variety, especially interesting here, because *quo* without a comparative is unusual except in Sallust. § 140; V 2 (5)". § 140 (in the syntactical appendix) reads, "*Quo* without a comparative, in final sentences, is rare. A number of instances occur in Sallust. G. 545. R. 1" G. 545. R. 1 reads, in the part which is relevant here, "*Quo* without comparative is rare and cited only from Plautus, Terence, Sallust, Ovid and later Latin". I will not follow the references further, but elsewhere (in the introduction) is a partial list of occurrences of "*Quo* without a comparative in final clauses", in the general category of "Constructions peculiar to Sallust or exaggerated by him, or employed in an unusual sense".

The avoidance of repetition by the grouping of the facts does not seem especially effective. My own opinion is that simple consecutive notes, each saying whatever is to be said about the part of the text under consideration, with an index to co-ordinate them when needful, afford the better method. To make appendices and to classify and group one's notes is fun for the editor, but I think it is a drag upon the student's attention.

On the other hand, the notes of the one kind which in a book intended for school use should have been detached from the rest of the commentary—the textual notes—have here been incorporated with the others. Text criticism, as a great critic has remarked, is a necessary evil; but, so far as school boys are concerned it should be put considerably in the background. Some of these critical notes are, of course, involved in the discussion of the meaning of the text, but not all of them have even this excuse; that on line 966, for instance, reads as if the pupil had other texts at hand for comparison, as the editor has.

At the end of the book the Vocabulary of Proper Names is separated from the regular vocabulary. This is a good plan; a pupil might be pardoned, however, if for the words *Kalendae* and *Nonae* he failed to look first among the proper names.

In the minor details of expression and punctuation, half practical, half aesthetic, which should show a practiced realization of the way ideas are conveyed and obscurity avoided by words seen in print rather than heard in modulated tones, the present book occasionally leaves somewhat to be desired. It would perhaps seem captious to illustrate in detail. A part of the note on line 318 (Chap. 17. 7), "*ipsi* for *sibi* stands for the same reason the ind. does", and the note on *opitulati sunt* (line 617, Chap. 33. 2), "only here in Sallust", will perhaps serve. The latter is not intended to indicate a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*.

These and such small questions as that of abbreviations—when to use them and when not—are evidently the mint and anise and cummin of scholarship, but they count in the impression of a book. Abbreviations sometimes cause more of a jolt to attention than the space they save is worth. The use of them calls for a certain uniformity of condensation. Forms like *adjs.*, *partics.* (i. e. participles, not particles); *plu.*, *subj.*, *subjunc.* are well enough in their place, but one of them looks a trifle queer in a sentence of colloquial amplitude with all the other words printed in full.

Detached expressions like "the acc. of thing with the pass." (note, line 829) seem to illustrate the danger to which we of the pedagogical tribe are more or less exposed, of developing a class-room argot that is more quaint than beautiful.

*Putas*, in the note to line 823, is a misprint for *petas*.

But in general, as might be inferred from the fact that the foregoing mild animadversions have mostly to do with matters of form, the commentary is substantially good. Certainly a student should have a pleasant and profitable time with this book, the addition of which to the group of school editions of the Catiline will, it is to be hoped, encourage the reading of the text, which has so much declined in this country in recent years.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK ALLAN P. BALL

Latin Lessons for Beginners. By Daniel W. Lothman. Boston: Ginn & Co. (1908). Pp. XII + 178.

This book owes its origin to the belief of its author and of other teachers that "better results would be secured from the study of Latin in secondary schools by a more extensive and more intelligent use of the grammar"; and that "by making its use compulsory in the first year, the 'grammar habit' is established early, and a broadened use of the grammar in succeeding years is secured". The author states that the book stood the test of a two years' trial in his own classroom before being put in final form.

The book, then, is a reversion to a type of beginners' book seldom seen in recent years, in that it requires a grammar to be used with it. It professes to be equally well adapted to any one of three grammars—the Allen and Greenough, the Bennett, and the Harkness. It was inevitable that there should be some slight difficulty of adjustment, since the grammars differ from one another in treatment of their subject-matter, and especially in terminology. Bennett, for example, calls a 'termination' that which the other two grammars call a 'case-ending'. Our author prefers 'termination'. He employs the useful term 'base' to denote the part of a noun or adjective which is unchanged in

declension, though the word appears not to be used in this sense by Bennett or Harkness. Mostly, however, he avoids the use of terms not pretty thoroughly established in usage. He leaves to the teacher the task of impressing on the student the characteristic nomenclature of the grammar in his hands. Such expressions as 'volitive subjunctive' and 'contingent condition' are found, in general, only in foot-notes.

The arrangement of the book is fairly systematic, much more so, at least, than that of most books in present use. After an outline of English Grammar, which seems to be a necessity in first-year Latin books nowadays, and an introductory lesson, we have alternately an inflection lesson and a lesson presenting one or two points of syntax. The development of inflection follows closely the order in the grammars, except that the verb is put in from the very beginning, and conjugation advances side by side with declension. The subjunctive mood is introduced in Lesson LIII, declension, comparison, numerals, and pronouns, as well as the indicative, infinitives, and participles of regular verbs, having been disposed of in the previous lessons. All inflections, regular and irregular, and the most important principles of syntax are covered in eighty-six lessons, twelve of which are review lessons. There follow Book I of the Gallic War, simplified and condensed to about one third, and the Life of Hannibal.

The matter preceding the simplified Caesar is contained in one hundred and three pages. If the outline of English Grammar be counted out, this is reduced to ninety-one. The omission of paradigms accounts in part for this brevity, but even with allowance made for the omission, the condensation is very noticeable. Brevity is a virtue which may be carried too far. There is no connected reading matter in Latin accompanying the eighty-six lessons, and by actual counting of lines it is found that the Latin sentences to be translated into English amount to only about seventeen pages. In spite of the author's successful experience, this seems inadequate, for the average class, as preparation for the reading of the Caesar selections. These, though simplified, are not particularly simple. Some difficulties remain, even in the earlier parts; and later, the long *oratio obliqua* of Chapter XXXI is not sufficiently changed, either by omissions or by simplification, to be very easy for beginners. In practice, most teachers will probably find it advisable to give their classes considerable easy reading from other sources, if they expect them to show reasonable facility when they come to these selections.

The execution of the book is scholarly. There are many praiseworthy features, and few things to be criticized. The explanations are clear, concise, and generally accurate. The vocabulary of the

lessons leads directly to Caesar. The sentences to be translated into Latin are made simple, as they should be. The frequent systematic reviews are most admirably constructed. The few paragraphs on English derivatives and Latin word-formation are noteworthy for their simplicity and clearness. The learning of the suffixes given, with their significance, will set the learner well on his way to the mastery of a subject of great importance. The book has a very complete and usable index.

For those teachers who agree entirely with the author's beliefs about the use of the grammar, there is probably no better book than this, supplemented as indicated above. Whether it is necessary or advisable to require the first-year student to use a grammar is a question regarding which opinions may differ. The matter of expense need not, perhaps, be considered very much, since a grammar must be bought sometime, if not in the first year, by those who continue the study of Latin. But the matter of the physical burden is really a serious one. Conditions in many schools compel that nearly all studying be done at home. This means that all books in use must be carried to school and back again every day. Furthermore, in some of these schools all books must be carried about wherever the student goes during the day. In such cases the addition of a pound to the weight of the load which the boy, or especially the girl, of twelve or thirteen must shoulder is a thing of importance. This may, perhaps, be an argument in favor of having the edition of Caesar contain its own grammar. Still, the students in Caesar are a year older than those in first-year classes, and for the proper study of syntax the complete grammar is imperatively necessary. But it is not imperatively necessary for the mastery of the simple reflections of the first year, and it is at least debatable whether the need of constantly referring to another book for these is not a hindrance rather than a profit. Yet few would disagree with the author in his belief that the 'grammar habit' should be established early, and in the opinion of the writer of this review the systematic study of the grammar should begin with the reading of the first Latin author.

ARCHIBALD L. HODGES

WADLEIGH HIGH SCHOOL, New York City.

The Seven against Thebes of Aeschylus. Edited by T. G. Tucker, University of Melbourne. Cambridge, England: at the University Press (1908).

This edition contains a preface and introduction; then the text on the left hand page with a prose translation on the right. Underneath these, running across both pages, is the Critical Apparatus. Below, in two columns on each page, is a very full commentary. At the end are appendices and indices. The whole plan, even the type and every-

thing except the binding, are exactly as in the case of Jebb's Sophocles, with the meters omitted. It is needless to remark on the elegance of the volume.

In the preface (4 pp.) are stated with acumen the qualifications necessary for a competent interpreter of a play of Aeschylus, and the author modestly claims "a fair degree" of the needful preparation. He here takes occasion also to discuss briefly Wecklein's aspersions on his "Geschmach". Since *de gustibus non est disputandum*, the reviewer takes no part in this controversy.

The introduction (50 pp.), beginning with the founding or, rather, the origin of Thebes, narrates and ably discusses practically everything that can shed light on the play. The topics discussed are: (a) Primitive Thebes, Argos and the Theban Sagas; (b) Cadmus, the Labdacidae and the Septem; (c) Cadmea and the Seven Gates of Thebes; (d) The Play of Aeschylus; (e) The Text (with an account of the Mss. and Scholia). Section D on the play is specially important, and merits close study; but a brief summary of it would be useless.

Prefixed to the text are the *ὑπόθεσις* and the list of the *δράματος πρόσωπα*, both annotated, and a technical analysis of the play.

The translation we Americans should call a paraphrase and a very free paraphrase. This fact will be commended by all who are familiar with Aeschylus and the impossibility of turning his speech literally into English. Take, for instance, 335-357 *βλαχαὶ δ' αἱματώσσαι τῶν ἐπιμαστιδίων ἀρτιτρεφεῖς βρέμονται*. This is rendered 'Bloodstained the mothers of newborn babes cry plaintively for their sucklings'. Anything approximating a literal translation of this passage would be almost sure to suggest the *οἰωγὰς . . . ὀμφαλοδόσσας* of Aristophanes. The paraphrase or translation everywhere shows a thorough comprehension of the text and a delicate appreciation of its highly poetic coloring, along with the rare faculty of reproducing such coloring in English. One difficulty, however, in such a case is inevitable. If one were to compose in English a prose work in the style of this translation, such a work would be regarded as stilted and bombastic. But, of course, the reader has constantly the consciousness that he is reading a prose translation of poetry, which fact does much to relieve the difficulty named. Still one could almost wish that the author had versified his translation or, at least, thrown it into rhythmical prose, as in fact, whether consciously or not, he has done in many places.

The poetic taste just mentioned has greatly aided the editor in constituting his text. This text may be called in the main conservative; but some fifty-five emendations of the editor have been introduced. Of these a few are convincing, most are plausible, and none impossible. Rarely, if ever, is an emenda-



tion adopted except where one is necessary. All the critical work is marked also by great acumen and profound scholarship.

To discuss the commentary adequately would lead far beyond appropriate bounds for this review. The scholarship of the author is everywhere felt, and it is an unusual pleasure to read comments based on the assumption that the reader knows some Greek. Occasionally familiar passages cited as illustrations are without indication even of the author, and not a few are omitted entirely, though they must have been familiar to the editor. The parallel passages cited are remarkably full and are not confined to Greek. No one could expect them to be complete, and in a few instances examples seem to have been overlooked. For instance, on 913 *παῖδα τὸν αὐτῶς πρὸς αὐτῇ θεμένα*, there is a sound discussion of the use of reflexive with middle, but none of the examples cited is so apposite as Isae. 3. 1 Πέρρος. . . ἐποίησεν Εὐδοίον τὸν ἀδελφὸς τὸν ἐμὸν νῦν αὐτῷ, a passage with which not all readers are likely to be familiar.

It is impossible that any two scholars should be in complete accord about everything in a work like the Septem, and it would be unprofitable to discuss here all the points of divergence between the editor and the reviewer. Attention, however, may be called to the treatment of two metrical questions. On 811 we read "The paroemiac verse regularly ends in — — — = but — — — = is no less permissible (cf. Suppl. 7, Pers. 33)". To these examples add Ag. 366. On 1048 we find "We are prevented from reading ὠλέσαστε (Elmsl.) by the rule that an anapaest is not followed by a dactyl in the same dipody". Whether Elmsley's emendation is good or not does not matter, but the rule that the last complete foot of the paroemiac in non-melic anapaests must be an anapaest is as rigorous as the rule that an anapaest must not be followed by a dactyl in the same dipody. Cp. Ag. 358, 797, 1569, Suppl. 5.

This edition, unlike Jebb's *Sophocles*, does not contain any general treatment of the meters. Possibly this is as it should be. We are now at our zero point in knowledge of meters. Formerly we knew a great deal; after a while we shall know a great deal (and in the reviewer's opinion it will be essentially what we used to know); but at present we know nothing.

The appendices are A, Consonantizing of *v* and *i*. B, Addenda to Notes. C, The Text of the Scholia of the Medicean Ms. These appendices are not included in this review.

The printing is remarkably accurate. Very few misprints occur, none in the text having been noted by the reviewer. The conventional syllabification is ignored. This, as a rule, is no serious matter, but

in one instance it jars: on 545 the Arcadians are called *πρὸς—Ἄγριοι*.

To sum up: this edition is the result of prolonged study by one possessing profound scholarship, acute critical intuition and delicate poetic sense; and it is safe to say that for many years to come it will be the standard edition of this play.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA MILTON W. HUMPHREYS

### ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE CLASSICS

Six lectures delivered before the University of Oxford by Arthur J. Evans, Andrew Lang, Gilbert Murray, F. B. Jevons, J. L. Myres, W. Warde Fowler. Edited by R. R. Marett. Oxford: Clarendon Press (1908). Pp. 191. \$2.00 net.

The mere names of the authors of these papers guarantee their interest and value for all who care for the Classics. Dr. Evans's article, which is illustrated, deals with pictography and the origin of script, a subject which he will handle at greater length in his *Scripta Minoa*, shortly to be published by the Clarendon Press. Mr. Lang, in his paper on Homer and Anthropology, will have none of the expurgation theory. He is prepared to admit that "some editorial work was done for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* at Athens before the Persian War", though he rejects Dr. Verrall's hypothesis about the recension, so brilliantly set forth in the *Quarterly Review* for last July. Mr. Lang, in summing up his own position, says: "Homer sings for an audience that has lived down the ape, though the tiger has not wholly died. . . . Historic Greece was not very successful in expelling the beast from human nature. The poets of historical Greece were never so successful as Homer. I infer that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are prehistoric, the flowers of a brief age of Achaean civilization, an age when the society of princes and ladies had a taste extraordinarily pure and noble". Professor Gilbert Murray deals with anthropology in the Greek Epic tradition outside Homer, and points out that the non-Homeric material is in many cases more primitive, and especially that "a great proportion of our anthropological material is already to be found in pre-historic Crete. . . . To me it seems that there are many bridges visible from Crete to Hesiod or Eumelus, or even Pausanias; but the gulf between Crete and Homer seems, in certain places, to have no bridge". Principal Jevons's subject is Graeco-Italian Magic. Mr. Warde Fowler deals with the practice of *lustratio* in a very interesting paper, some of which has already appeared in the *Hibbert Journal*; though this, by the way, is not stated.

The longest and perhaps the most interesting and important of the papers is that by Professor Myres on Herodotus and Anthropology. To the ardent lover of Herodotus it is very delightful to have him hailed as the Father of Anthropology, and to

find his supposedly unscientific methods vindicated. Professor Myres attempts to answer the question "How far was a science of anthropology, in the sense in which we understand it, contemplated as possible in the Great Age of Greece"? He refers to Hesiod's scheme of archaology, and remarks that his observation that primitive man was a forest-dweller, who grew no corn and subsisted on acorns, shows a reasonable interest in human origins far beyond the average of archaic or barbarian speculations. Anaximander and Archelaus of Miletus held views which "presuppose an almost Darwinian outlook on the animal kingdom, and an understanding of comparative anatomy, which hardly becomes possible again before the Renaissance". Aeschylus again, especially in the fragments of the Prometheus Solutus, gives ethnological details "of high value, both as a record of current knowledge and as an indication of the contemporary phases of theory". Herodotus advances beyond Aeschylus in his scheme of ethnology, as in the famous passage (8. 144), where the Athenians reject the proposals of Alexander of Macedon, and refuse to desert the Greek cause, for "Greece is of one blood, and of one speech, and has dwelling-places of gods in common, and sacrifices to them, and habits of similar customs". As Professor Myres says, "To this analysis, modern ethnology has little or nothing to add. . . . So far as Herodotus presents us with an ordered scheme of anthropological thought—with a science of anthropology, in fact—he is little, if at all, behind the best thought of our own days". Again, Herodotus was not handicapped by "those literary misconceptions which so long retarded the study of man in the modern world". He is prepared to grant 10,000, or even 20,000 years for the Nile to fill up the whole Red Sea (2. 11)—too short an allowance, from the point of view of modern geology, but "more than double the whole length allotted to 'geological time' within the memory of men still living".

One of the most suggestive parts of the paper is the remark that of all the data that Herodotus gives us about foreign peoples two items are more insistently recorded than the others—the marriage customs and the principal source of food. These Professor Myres connects with the question of the position of woman at Athens—a burning one already, as we can see from the discussion in the Eumenides, 'Is a man nearer akin to his father or to his mother', and of course carried further in the plays of Euripides—and with the views set forth by Hippocrates, that men's social organization as well as their physique is affected by their economic régime—ideas that have their climax in the *Republic* of Plato (on the second point, note especially the diet of the citizen, as set forth by Socrates,

Rep. 370-2, and Glaucon's comments thereon). Professor Myres concludes with an appeal to others to carry forward "an inquiry into the anthropological basis of the political doctrine of Socrates; and so to link him on this side of his thought with that great body of naturalist work, which I would gladly believe that he came not to destroy but to fulfil".

In this short review it is impossible to do justice to this very interesting paper, much of which has not been commented on at all, but perhaps enough has been quoted to show its interest and suggestiveness to students of the Classics in general, and of Herodotus in particular, "the man who stands next after Homer as exponent on a generous scale of his country's thought and life". G. M. HIRST

BARNARD COLLEGE

Herodotus VII and VIII. Edited with Introduction and Notes by C. F. Smith and A. G. Laird, of the University of Wisconsin. New York: American Book Co. (1908). Pp. 8-17 Vita and Appreciation; 18-19, Epitome; 20-81 Grammatical Summary; 83-422, Text and Notes; 423-442, Bibliography, Textual Criticism and Indices.

Shall the twentieth century college editions of the Classics serve as repositories of the scholarly professor's gleanings, or shall the student's immediate needs be the criterion as to what shall be included in the regulation Introduction, Notes and Appendix? This edition shows tendencies in both directions, with a commendable leaning, however, towards the latter alternative. Sitzler's edition is used "especially as a guide in the effort to be brief, to the point and not over-learned".

This does not mean that scholarliness is in any degree sacrificed. The syntactical introduction—an independent study of Professor Laird's made expressly for this edition—is all that could be desired. In the logical arrangement of grammatical headings, as in the painstaking completeness of its illustrative references, it compares remarkably well with Seymour's Study of Homeric Usage.

Professor Smith's historical introduction lays no claim to originality. Borrowed from Stein's *Einführung*, it contains a helpful epitome of the nine books and an appreciative criticism of Herodotus as a historian. The Vita, however, might have been made more interesting and more pedagogically what it ought to be by the omission of the full-page discussion of the date of Herodotus's death, and by the insertion of the easier citations (especially Suidas) for the mass of foot-references.

The carefully prepared indices are praiseworthy, with their elaborate lists of Herodotean words, idioms, periphrases and notable constructions, Ionic words, poetical words and phrases.

The monotony of the solid text is broken and the student's attention secured by printing the notes at the foot of the page. The commentary to Book VII is the work of Professor Smith, that to Book VIII of Professor Laird. As the notes to the latter book naturally abound in more continuous references to the syntactical introduction, instructors will perhaps find it more suitable to begin with. A faithful text, a frontispiece showing the bust of the great historian, four maps, are other features that commend this edition to the instructor. He must be indulgent enough with his classes, and tactful enough to see that not all the appeals in the notes to compare this and that other reference with some other portion of Greek literature or of Herodotus are meant as duties to be fulfilled by even the most ambitious of his students, but rather meant for his own guidance and illumination. For that reason many of the phrases and abbreviations in the notes are to be explained by the instructor. There is an occasional evidence of the bungling work that a bad type will do, or a careless electrotypist or press-feeder may be guilty of, that mars the perfect appearance of the book, requires the watchful eye of the instructor, and ought really to be apologized for by the publishers.

ABRAHAM DEIXEL

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, Brooklyn, N. Y.

#### FARM, CASTLE, AND CITY

Dr. Schuchhardt, best known in this country by his *Life of Schliemann*, as Director of the Hanover Museum has given much attention during the last years to the rise and growth of city settlements in northern Germany. In an article published in the *Neue Jahrbuecher*, June, 1908, he makes known some of the results, and draws highly interesting, though perhaps debatable, conclusions for the oldest settlement in Greece and Italy.

Contrary to opinions prevailing in former years, most of the north German towns did not spring up as walled settlements. The nobles themselves did by no means live in fortified castles, but as a rule spent their time on a farm, with their families, dependents and serfs. For times of war, however, they maintained in the immediate neighborhood a walled place of refuge (*Fluchtburg*). The security thus guaranteed drew to the neighborhood of the farm artisans and merchants, and from these unfortified settlements the walled town has sprung by being incorporated within the enlarged walls of the Refuge. The same origin is claimed by Mr. Schuchhardt for the Greek city. Two expressions occur in Homer for city: *ἄστυ* and *πόλις*. It is customary to interpret them as citadel and city, respectively. The author claimed that the true relation is the opposite one, *ἄστυ* being the, originally open, settlement of the lower classes, *πόλις* being the walled

citadel. He examines in support of his claim several passages in Homer, e. g. *Iliad* 6. 287 ff. Here Hecuba summons the old women throughout the *ἄστυ*, and then goes with them to the *πόλις*, where the temple of Athene is situated. The only attribute, it is claimed, which Homer gives to the *ἄστυ* is that of great, while the laudatory epithets of beautiful, well walled and so forth are lavished on the *πόλις*. In further support of his theory, the author quotes from a communication from Professor Osthoff. According to this scholar, *πόλις* is etymologically connected with Latin *palatium*, and Lithuanian *pilti*, 'castle', from a root meaning 'to heap up' (an earth wall). An examination of further passages is given to prove that even in Homeric time city life had not yet taken the place of the unwalled settlement near the farmyard of the overlord. In support of this claim Mr. Schuchhardt quotes the description of the home of Odysseus, and of that of Circe. Even in the much more splendid home of Menelaos the geese were in the yard. Archaeological investigation of the reputed sites of the homes of Menelaos and Nestor has so far failed to reveal any trace of Mycenaean palaces. The existence of castles of refuge is seemingly proven from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who ascribes in his *Archaeologia* the founding of such places to Servius Tullius. But in Elis also there were such refuges, by name of *Pyrgos* and *Thalamae*. Excavations on the *Aspis* at Argos, likewise, show only a fortification as protection in times of war, without any trace of a lordly palace within the lines. For Athens a similar condition can be proven from the embarrassment in which Thucydides finds himself (2. 15). Before Theseus, he says, the present *ἀκρόπολις* was the *πόλις*, including the parts to its south. The proof of this is, among others, that the acropolis is still called *πόλις*. This embarrassment, says Mr. Schuchhardt, arises from a confusion between the earlier and the later meaning of the word *πόλις*. As a matter of fact, the acropolis was at all times merely the citadel, and so the excavations have revealed there the remnants of a Mycenaean palace. The oldest settlement, however, was in the plain of the Ilissos, near the spring *Kallirrhoe*, and it is for this reason that we find some of the oldest sanctuaries near this spring, just as the sanctity of this water, mentioned by Thucydides, finds its easy explanation in the fact that it was the spring of the oldest city. Here, then, in prehistoric times, was the farm of the lord, while the acropolis served only as refuge for war times. A faint recollection of this fact may still be discerned in the life of Theseus according to Plutarch, who makes the *Kallirrhoe* district the seat of the palace of Aegeus.



That the Palatium represents the oldest settlement in the city of Rome is a recognized fact. But the name, according to the etymology given above, would prove it to have been merely the place of refuge, while the people really lived elsewhere. Proof of this is found in the existence of the thirty Curiae, which originally held the Roman land in the manner of the Slavic house community, as common, unalienable property. Professor Osthoff again has furnished Mr. Schurchhardt with an etymology bearing out his contention. Jacob Grimm—and he is approved by men of the standing of Fick, Corssen and Schmidt—explained *curia* as = *cusia*, Ger. *Hus*, Eng. *house*. The *curia* would thus be the homestead of the old clan, while the Palatium was used only as a place of refuge.

E. R.

## CORRESPONDENCE

Professor Ashmore's "meager response" to my review<sup>1</sup> of his edition of Terence (written at the request of Professor Knapp) calls for a few statements in reply.

(1) Mr. Ashmore invited consideration of his "critical discernment" and the "critical value" of his edition. The book was therefore judged mainly from the critical point of view, especially as to the choice of text and the use of manuscript evidence.

(2) No justification whatever is offered by Mr. Ashmore for the free substitution of *equidem* for *quidem* or for the introduction into Terence of peculiar forms like *ist*, *rest*, *ipsust* and *reapse*.

(3) Mr. A. Palmer does not sanction *pudicitiam* taken as *pudisham*, in Plaut. Amph. 930, corresponding to *inimicitias*, taken as *inimishas*, in Ph. 370. He does think (with Spengel) that the first two syllables may be "slurred into one".

(4) I do not accept *dicerē* in Andria 23, nor should Mr. Ashmore. For the correct scansion of the verse, see Spengel and Nencini (the latter seemingly unknown to Mr. Ashmore). Even for Plautus, says Lindsay, "the few apparent examples of *ē* in the infinitive are probably illusory" (Captivi, Editio Maior, p. 18).

(5) Mr. Ashmore has edited Terence, not Plautus, and Plautine scansions do not necessarily hold for Terence. For the difference, see Mr. Ashmore's own reference to Leo, Plautinische Forschungen (p. 224, N. 4).

(6) Typographical errors are a 'necessary evil', but they should be corrected when they have once been pointed out.

(7) Alleged German prejudice against British scholarship is a foolish bogey. Was not Lindsay recently selected to write the Bericht über Plautus for the Bursian-Kroll Jahresbericht?

(8) Unfortunately some men are so constituted

<sup>1</sup> See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 2, 140-141, 148-150.

that they cannot face adverse criticism without impugning the motives of their critics. Does Mr. Ashmore impute malice also to the well-known reviewer of his book in the Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie (No. 1 for 1909)?

H. R. FAIRCLOUGH

STAMFORD UNIVERSITY, California

I have read Professor Fairclough's rejoinder, and can only say that I refer the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY to my remarks in 2, 148-150, and that I leave to them the decision regarding the fairness of Mr. Fairclough's criticisms. To prolong the discussion further can lead to no good. To one thing, however, I desire to plead guilty: I was mistaken in saying (p. 149) that Professor Fairclough accepts *dicerē* in Andria 23, although the verse is susceptible of this scansion, if (as some good authorities hold) the final *-e* is long; there is nothing in Professor Fairclough's edition of the Andria to show that he accepts this view. But I see no reason to modify anything else in my reply.

Mr. Paul Wessner's review of my Terence in the Wochenschrift is good-natured enough, as is clear from its closing remarks on the subject of the Notes. That he would criticize me for adopting and praising Tyrrell's text, which he had himself reviewed adversely in the Wochenschrift, was to be expected.

SIDNEY G. ASHMORE

UNION COLLEGE.

## FANCIES

Suggested by a late distinguished Departure from our Shores.

Evamuit plausus populi strepitusque senatus  
et perturbati murmura rauca fori;  
non nisi ventorum fremitus comitantur euntem  
undarum et planctus, nave secante viam.  
Securus videt ille minas caelique fretique;  
quem pavet ursarum maxima, quid timeat?  
Forte gubernator timidus circumspicit astra,  
incertusque viae fletque vocatque deos;  
intrepidus subit ille, gubernandique peritus,  
qua populum rexit, dirigit arte ratem.  
Tum pavidos, quos iam taedet maris atque viarum,  
solatur socios, fortia verba loquens.  
Res gestas narrat, maiorum insignia facta,  
quae novit, quo sol conditur, Oceanus,  
insula vel nuper quae vidit, cuius ad oras,  
ante alios clarus, venerat asper eques.  
Aut etiam causas vivendi subicit ille;  
natum quemque docet non sibi sed patriae;  
et vitae pretium subolem proponit, et orat,  
fortes forte genus ne periisse sinant.  
Interea Libyco fines bellicae ferini  
gaudia secreto prospicit ipse animo.  
Illic immanis dependet ab arbore serpens,  
per notas tenebras itque reditque leo;  
rhinoceros illic atque ingens simia quaeque  
pardo quaeque ab equo belua nomen habet.  
Nil ibi non magnum; maior tamen ille propinquat,  
cuius in adventum Syrtica terra tremat.

W. H. KIRK

RUTGERS COLLEGE

## THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

To persons outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board of editors:

### Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, New York

### Associate Editors

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College

ERNST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

MITCHELL CARROLL, The George Washington University

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

### Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

## Columbia University Summer Session

July 7—Aug. 18, 1909.

### COURSES IN GREEK.

Elementary Course. Associate Professor Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College.

Plato, The Gorgias and Phaedo. Associate Professor Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College.

Homer, Iliad and Odyssey. Associate Professor Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College.

### COURSES IN GREEK ART.

History of Greek Art. Professor Oliver S. Tonks, Princeton University.

Greek Sculpture. Professor Oliver S. Tonks, Princeton University.

### COURSES IN LATIN.

Prose Composition. Professor Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University.

Suetonius. Selected Lives. Professor John C. Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania.

The Satires of Juvenal. Professor Harry L. Wilson, Johns Hopkins University.

Vergil's Aeneid, Books II and VI. Professor Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University.

History of Roman Literature. Professor John C. Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania.

Latin Inscriptions. Professor Harry L. Wilson, Johns Hopkins University.

## Caesar's Gallic War

By W. B. GUNNISON & W. H. HARLEY, Erasmus Hall High School

All the text, grammar and composition needed for second year work; convenient, practical, economical. \$1.25.

### THE FIRST YEAR OF LATIN

By the same authors; a preparation for Caesar. \$1.00.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

NEW YORK

BOSTON

CHICAGO

## A Noteworthy Adoption

On March 22, 1909, the School Committee of the City of Boston authorized Pearson's Essentials of Latin for Beginners for use in all the High and Latin Schools of the city.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY, Publishers

## COLLEGE SERIES OF GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS

Every book edited by an eminent scholar

Some of the Latin Authors	Some of the Greek Authors
CATULLUS	AESCHYLUS
CICERO	HOMER
HORACE	EURIPIDES
JUVENAL	LUCIAN
LIVY	LYSIAS
PLAUTUS	PAUSANIAS
TACITUS	PLATO
	THUCYDIDES
	XENOPHON

## GINN AND COMPANY, Publishers

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

LONDON

## BEGINNING LATIN

By J. EDMUND BARSS

HOTCHKISS SCHOOL, LAKEVILLE, CONN.

The constructive method employed in the treatment of inflections arouses the pupil's interest by saying, "Here are certain things; build with them after such a fashion", instead of "Here is a list; remember it".

The book secures (1) mastery of forms; (2) the nucleus of a working vocabulary; (3) a grasp of the broad principles of the Latin sentence.

Every fifth lesson is a Latin reading lesson. The principles of elementary syntax and of sentence structure are amply illustrated in the reading lessons and in the exercises.

9 9 Cloth, 332 pages, \$1.00. ♡ ♡

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

## HIGH SCHOOL COURSE IN LATIN COMPOSITION

By CHARLES MCCOY BAKER, Horace Mann School,

Teachers College, and ALEXANDER JAMES INGLIS,

Horace Mann School, Teachers College. 12 mo. Cloth.

xiii + 463 pages. \$1.00 net.

This book consists of three parts arranged for practice in writing Latin during the last three years of school, and, in addition, a summary of the Elements of Syntax for reference.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

## Virgil Aeneid Books I-VI

By H. R. FAIRCLOUGH, Professor of Latin, Leland Stanford Junior University, and SELDON L. BROWN, Principal of Wellesley Mass. High School. pp. lxi + 515 + 140

1908.

Read the review of this book in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY of Dec. 12, 1908.

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO.

Boston

New York

Chicago

London